



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09 831,213	05/03/2001	Mauri Salmisuo	MED 2 1233	2635

7590 07/21/2003  
Fay Sharpe Fagan  
Minnich & McKee  
Seventh Floor  
1100 Superior Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44114-2518

EXAMINER

MANOHARAN, VIRGINIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1764

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER

FILING DATE

FIRST NAME, LAST NAME

ADDRESS

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PATENT NUMBER

12

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

### ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE

- a) ☐ is extended to run \_\_\_\_\_ or continues to run 3 mos from the date of the final rejection
- b) ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).
- ☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 7/9/03 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☒ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- a) ☒ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
- b) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note)
- c) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note)
- d) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

*The proposed amendments would provide new 112 rejections for example. The "evaporator channels" in claim 3, line 5 (pt. 1) is inconsistent with the "evaporator channel" in lines 8, 12 & 14. In claim 3, line 10, "an" (second occurrence) should be "the" as the upper end is already 3-9-10. This has been submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims and if rewritten to overcome the 112 rejections.*

2. ☒ Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. ☒ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be entered ☒ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: none  
Claims objected to: none  
Claims rejected: 1-12

However:

- ☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): 7/18/03

4. ☐ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because \_\_\_\_\_
5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.

*Other: Cont'd of Note: Supra*  
*the claimed "the upper end" in line 8 of claim 3 lacks the recited support. See also claim 16 in claim 6 "the same operation" lacks antecedent support and not understood.*